THE CHRISTIAN QUEST

Youth and Jesus' Way of Life

YOUTH AND DEBATING

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

Pamphlet Number Twelve

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

THE CHRISTIAN QUEST MATERIALS

All are uniform in size with this pamphlet.

I. Basic Materials for Leaders (These are recommended for every leader of youth)

What to Do in Using the Christian Quest Materials (An Introductory Pamphlet) ..... 10 cents
1. Qualities of an Effective Leader ..... 10 cents
2. How a Leader Proceeds with a Group ..... 10 cents
3. How to Study Individual Growth ..... 10 cents
4. How a Leader Uses Organization ..... 10 cents
5. Program Suggestions for Group Leaders ..... 20 cents

II. Resource Materials for Leaders (Each leader selects pamphlets from this list according to enterprises under way in his or her group)

6. Youth at Worship ..... 15 cents
7. Youth and Recreation ..... 15 cents
8. Youth and Dramatics ..... 25 cents
9. Youth in Camp ..... 15 cents
10. Youth and Story Telling ..... 15 cents
11. Book Friends of Youth ..... 15 cents
12. Youth and Debating ..... 15 cents
13. Youth in Co-operation (Co-operative young people's work) ..... 25 cents

All of above basic and resource materials for leaders, in print June 1928.

III. Materials for Boys, Girls and Young People Themselves.

1. A Book of Discovery for Younger Boys (Intermediate)
2. A Book of Discovery for Younger Girls (Intermediate)
3. A Book of Adventure for Older Boys (Senior)
4. A Book of Adventure for Older Girls (Senior)
5. A Book of Achievement for Young People (18-23 years)

Above materials for youth, in print October, 1928. Full information and prices from the International Council of Religious Education, 5 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago

Loose Leaf Binder, for which all these materials are punched ..... 60 cents

"My Chart of Individual Growth" (for pupil's charting) ..... 20 cents dozen

"My Task" (Leader's Record Card) ..... 15 cents dozen

By using the binder each leader accumulates his or her own leadership manual.

Other materials, looking towards a complete, unified curriculum are being prepared and will be available serially year by year.

Above prices are postpaid. Please send cash with orders.

Copyrighted 1928 by the International Council of Religious Education
Printed in U. S. A.

THE CHRISTIAN QUEST

Youth and Jesus' Way of Life

Resource Materials for Leaders

Pamphlet Number Twelve

YOUTH AND DEBATING

Prepared by

PROFESSOR C. D. HARDY

of Northwestern University

for the

COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF YOUTH

Approved for experimental use, February, 1928, by
International Council of Religious Education

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

5 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

TO THE LEADER OF YOUTH

This pamphlet is in your hands because you are a leader of youth or for some reason you are interested in that magic period of adolescence between twelve and twenty-three years of age. Therefore, we, the committee, would like to make certain facts clear to you before you go on to explore the pamphlet itself.

First, the subject of this pamphlet, "Youth and Debating," deals with an important part of a complete youth program and curriculum; it is, therefore, **one in a series.** The complete list of those available at present is printed on the inside front cover. We recommend that you secure the basic pamphlets and such of the resource pamphlets as will best fit your needs. The cover binder holds your materials in one place and will also contain your graded lesson quarterlies or other helps of a similar size; when one binder is filled with these working tools of the craft of youth leadership, many leaders procure another binder and thus create volume two of their leader's library. The youth materials are for your pupils themselves.

Second, these materials are to be used as **aids in building a church program with youth.** They suggest to the leader both an approach and a process for successful work with a group. In this approach and process the leader comes to recognize the elements that ought to enter into an abundant Christian life. The materials now prepared deal with those elements in such a program that are at present less adequately provided for elsewhere. They are intended to strengthen and supplement whatever lesson courses and other curriculum materials may now be in use in your church. The committee now has plans under way for developing, in co-operation with other committees at work in this field, a complete and unified curriculum into which these materials will in time merge.

Third, the name given to these program materials, *The Christian Quest,* with the sub-title "Youth and Jesus' Way of Life," was chosen by the committee only after consulting with youth itself. A vote was conducted by the committee among over three thousand one hundred young people between twelve and twenty-three years of age. These

were from all denominations and from all sections of the United States and most of Canada, thus forming a cross section of church adolescent life. In the title chosen there have been combined the four ideas that had the readiest appeal to youth, namely, Quest, Christian, Youth, and Way. The committee is carrying forward further experimentation and study before recommending symbolic names for the three age-groups in the young people's division. The meaning of this name can be interpreted to youth in many ways and its appeal upon their lives is always deep and far-reaching. For example, worship programs built around the theme "The Christian Quest" are in the September, October and November, 1928 numbers of the *International Journal of Religious Education*, 5 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago.

Fourth, these materials are not intended for use exclusively in any one form of organization, but can be used in any organization that you and other local leaders decide is best suited to your local conditions.

Fifth, two denominations, the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the Methodist Episcopal Church, have issued slightly adapted editions of these materials for use in their churches. This has become desirable because of the desire of these churches to adapt these materials more closely to their own denominational types of organization than could be done in a pamphlet used by all communions. These changes are mainly in pamphlet number four on Organization. All the changes are in thorough harmony with the principles set forth in these materials. These two denominations have joined with the others in co-operatively creating and approving these materials in this present common edition. It is suggested that leaders of these churches secure their own denominational editions from their own headquarters.

Sixth, these materials are prepared by a committee representing thirty-nine denominations and a number of other agencies dealing with Christian programs for youth. So they represent a co-operative effort of **North American Protestantism.** The names of the committee members are given on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Yours in the Christian Quest,

THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF YOUTH.

CONTENTS OF THIS PAMPHLET

		Page
I.	Guiding Principles in Debating	5
II.	The Debate Question	6
III.	Analysis of the Proposition	8
IV.	Finding and Testing Evidence	10
V.	Forms that Evidence May Take in Argument	13
VI.	Organizing the Evidence	17
VII.	Final Expression in Language	19
VIII.	Oral Expression of the Argument	21
IX.	Refutation, or Meeting Contentions of Opponents	22
X.	Attitude and Conduct of Debaters	23
XI.	Suggestions to Leaders of Groups	24
XII.	Sample Brief of Debate	27
XIII.	Questions for Debate	32
	Reference Books	36
	Further Training for Leaders of Youth	37
	National Denominational Offices	38
	State and Provincial Council Offices	38

Youth and Debating

I. GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN DEBATING

THE true function of debating is to reach reasonable conclusions on or about a proposition that has been carefully stated. It is not primarily to win a contest, though this may be a desirable by-product. It is not merely to show that one man is superior to another in his power to reason accurately, though the development of the power to present a well reasoned statement is a dominant function in debating. Winning is secondary; it is never primary.

Emphasis is needed at this point because debating is too often looked upon as just a game in which the contestants contend only for victory. When winning is considered the chief aim of debating, the tendency, with young debaters especially, is to emphasize tricks, strategy, maneuvering facts so as to catch an opponent and to make technical interpretations of a question, rather than to rely on clear statement, sane analysis, dependable authority, and careful selection and organization of facts and evidence.

The object, then, of debating is to develop the power of the individual. One must develop the ability to understand the meaning of a proposition, and this is not always as simple as may, at first, appear; to investigate source materials to find evidence to support the proposition; to organize that evidence in such a form that it appears as proof of the argumentative point; and, finally, to give such a written or oral expression to ideas that the meaning of the writer or speaker is clear, persuasive, convincing, and impressive.

The object of debate is, further, to train the individual to understand the point of view of others, to give full weight and consideration to the opinions and evidence that an opponent may present. In no other way is the debater going to be able to adjust himself and his own argument to meet the opposition in the strongest possible manner; and in no other way can the individual get the best training for himself and thus get the most out of the debating opportunity and experience.

Debating thus becomes a discipline, a discipline of mind and spirit. It is an exercise to be entered into with enthusiasm and energy, and with a desire to make the very best

case possible for the chosen point of view, recognizing, as one must, that, in human life as it is, there are two sides to all practical questions and knowing also that modesty best becomes the victor and that the good loser is always an admirable character.

II. THE DEBATE QUESTION

The debate question ought, as far as possible, to fit the capacity of the debater. Is he young and without experience? Is he mature and trained by some actual debating practice? Is he a high school man with limited information on questions of fact? Is he a college man with considerable knowledge and background about human affairs?

These questions and others of similar nature are fundamental considerations, when the individual is thinking about what resolutions or principles shall be selected for debating. Mistakes are not infrequently made at this point. A statement of principles is often selected with no thought of adjustment to the capacities and information, or ability to get information, of those who are to work out the argument and to present it, from the platform, in the actual debate.

In a limited discussion on the selection of debating questions, brief suggestions only can be made. After consideration of the relationship of the question to the speaker, perhaps the following observations will be helpful, though by no means covering all that might be written on the subject.

In the first place, when possible, the question should be timely, lively and up-to-date. This suggestion is important because both the speaker and the audience demand consideration. Any debate will be somewhat formal, to be sure—this is unavoidable—but any effort to make the discussion lively and vital for the practical interests of society will stimulate both speaker and hearer. The spirit and intellectual interests of a particular occasion, when once aroused, will affect the quality of the debater's work, even though he be young and without much experience on the platform. The atmosphere of the occasion may be enlivened, or may be deadened, by the nature of the principles under discussion. The type of the question chosen is not the final word on whether or not the debate is to be spirited or otherwise, but it is a contributing factor.

In the second place, the discussion ought to be centered on what is interesting to the speaker. Good debating rests upon investigation to discover facts and principles. This investigation involves hard work and patient application of time and energy. Debaters are human beings and, like all people, they labor harder and for longer hours on what has, for them, considerable interest. After investigation comes expression, both written and oral. Is there ever good expression without enthusiasm? And is there ever enthusiasm, real emotional urge, where there is no interest? True, the speaker may drive himself to get energy and force in expression, when the discussion does not appeal vitally to him—this is the exception and not the rule—but he will do better, if these qualities come to him as a result of a real interest in what he is discussing. Every great debater, who has left his impress upon the oral discussions of his time, is a testimonial to the importance of this suggestion.

And finally, any question for debating ought to contain a statement of principles sufficiently definite to hold the discussion within reasonable limits. To this contention there may be, here and there, exceptions, but, on the whole, the foregoing rule is sound. Debate is promoted and supported, and ought to be, because it trains young people to think to the point, and to express their ideas in a definite manner upon definitely outlined matter. Even though debate be looked upon as an intellectual sport, as some contend, the principle is the same. Advantage is to be had over another contender, in proportion as all the forces of facts and influences are organized into a unified attack on specific contentions. Debating as a sport and debating as intellectual training have, at least, this much in common.

Any proposition that is so broadly stated, or involves so extended a field of investigation, as to make this definite clash in discussion impossible, may well be omitted from consideration for debating purposes. Organization, and still more organization, of facts, authorities, and inferences into a compact unit to make a single impression ought to dominate the debater's efforts. The debate question in which such development of argument is not possible probably covers too much ground, and ought to be restated so as to limit it, or should be excluded altogether.

While rigid rules are often vague and must be interpreted with good sense and in the light of a practical situa-

tion, the following statements, covering the debate question, may be suggestive:

The question is undebatable:

1. If it is obviously true or false.
2. If its meaning is so ambiguous that a reasonable interpretation is not possible.
3. If, for a given occasion, it is so broad, and if it covers so much ground, that a reasonable discussion of its issues cannot be presented in the time allowed.
4. If it covers technical material only, or chiefly, and the proposed debaters have no knowledge of the technical matters involved.
5. If it is so stated that a single, definite clash in discussion is impossible. The so-called compound question falls in this class.

On the other hand, the question is debatable:

1. If it presents one central idea.
2. If it covers ground that the debaters know something about or are in a position to learn something about.
3. If it is simply stated so that the speakers can understand what it means.
4. If its content is interesting to, and arouses the enthusiasm of, the individuals called upon to discuss it.
5. If it is non-technical in its nature and is to be discussed by those who must depend upon their own resources to discover the facts for purposes of evidence and proof.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSITION

When the debate question is decided upon, the next step is the analysis. What do its terms mean? What are the issues, or the points of argument, upon which its strength or weakness depends? What types of evidence will be strongest to prove the points of view that the debater takes?

Answering such questions as these is the function of analysis. At the outset the debater must learn why the question has been or is being discussed at all; for it is out of this background of history that the issues arise. Every question that is worth debating at all, arises out of certain conditions in human life and its institutions. Some things have been tried and have shown faults that must be eliminated; or wrong policies in education, social life, religion, and other fields have been followed and new policies must be advocated until public opinion is willing to adopt them. For example, the Philippine Islands have been under the control of the United States for nearly thirty years. During

that time the facts show that the policies of the government have been satisfactory to some people and not satisfactory to others. There is here then a conflict of opinion as to whether present policies should be continued or independence should be granted. It is out of the study of the facts of this experience that we arrive at the reasons for or against the continuance of the government's present policy. This type of work is analysis to get at issues.

Issues then are the main lines of reasoning that are to be followed in developing a subject. They may not be chosen arbitrarily; they are the logical outgrowth of the analysis of the question. Too often the mistake is made of superficially considering a question and then selecting those argumentative points that suit the fancy of the debater. This plan may overlook entirely the main issue, which can be discovered only by careful study into, and thought about, the question. Finding the main issues is, then, the first business of debate, as it is the chief business of life.

As a part of this analysis the definition of terms used is an important consideration. What do the words of the question mean anyhow, as they are used? Words do not always mean the same thing to all people and under all circumstances. Are the terms of the question used in the commonly accepted meaning? Are they used in a purely technical sense, meaning a particular thing for this proposition? Or are they used in a legal or a legislative sense? These and other questions of definition confront the debater.

In defining terms the dictionary ought not to be relied upon too exclusively, though it is always a foundation source of information on words. But the dictionary presents all the possible meanings of words and unless the debater finds a definition there that fits the sense in which his term is used in his question, he may get into considerable confusion and trouble. How then shall terms be defined?

Three suggestions may help. What do men of authority—men who know—say about the meaning of the term? When it has been used by capable writers on the question, how has the term been defined? For example, if the question be legal, what have the judges of courts said about the meaning of the term in question? If the proposition centers about a question of religion, what significance have the leaders of thought in the church put upon the meaning of terms?

In the second place, terms may be defined by exemplification. By this is meant selecting a single example of the application of the term to practical life. This means translating the term from the abstract sense with a concrete illustration. This is one of the clearest ways to define terms, because most human beings can grasp the specific much easier than they can the general.

Thirdly, use explication. Here the debater enlarges upon the mere statement. He points out relations and implications, calling attention to those special features of the term that have special significance for the question. Where the speaker has good powers of exposition, this method is strong, because the debater is never more clear than when he can express himself through the medium of his own individuality.

Making a good analysis is, then, it should be understood, the result of careful thinking about, and reflection upon, the facts connected with the proposition. This study involves not one side only but both sides of the question. Knowing one's opponent's position, or the position he must take, if he debates well, is just as important as knowing one's own. From such study only, can analysis lead to correct issues and definitions.

IV. FINDING AND TESTING EVIDENCE

Evidence is the thought and factual material of proof. Why should the reader, or hearer, as the case may be, respond favorably to the debater's point of view? He does so, if and when he does, because the debater has succeeded in presenting sound reasons and facts to support the conclusions he draws. This evidence may consist of reasoning, statistical material, or statements from men in authority who have made a special study of the subject and have drawn conclusions that support the debater in his contentions.

Where can this evidence be found? First, let the debater consult the content of his own mind. Too often the tendency is to hurry to the library to find out what someone else has said. This consultation of others should come, but not until the debater has exhausted his own resources. Vigor and freshness are needed in debate. What the individual himself thinks usually has more vitality, and can be more clearly stated, than what is presented from others.

Second, consult those who know. Capable and well informed men and women are usually glad to discuss practical questions with young people who want to learn. Ask questions, many of them. Nothing stimulates clear thinking about a question more than lively conversation with the individual who is in a position to have special information.

Third, review the most reliable sources in printed form, in which may appear discussions of some phases of the question. Magazines, the good ones, special articles, reports of the governments, and of special committees representing social, political, educational and religious bodies. Go to the library, consult the Reader's Guide, Poole's Index and the Annual Library Index. These and library card catalogues ought to locate any material that is really worth while.

Not everything that the debater finds may be useful. He must select. What shall govern his selection? Tests will need to be applied, especially to authority. The following are some of the principal tests to be used:

First, is the authority capable of knowing? Not every man is a good observer. Men do not always see accurately. Frequently they have never developed the habit of careful observing. And then there is the matter of judgment. Does the one who testifies, whether in writing or orally, express himself sanely or as an extremist? Do the facts presented by this authority appear to be in accord with the laws of human life and experience?

Second, has the authority been in a position to know the facts? This is important. Through experience in coming in contact with actual events that control or influence a movement in the social, economic or religious world, is the surest and most definite method of obtaining dependable information about that movement. Reading books about what has happened in Russia since 1917 in order to get the information upon which to base conclusions about that country, is not nearly so satisfactory a method to get facts as living in Russia during that period would be. And the writer who reports facts after the latter experience is likely to be, other things being equal, a more dependable judge and reporter than the individual who has had only the former experience. We think of Herbert Hoover as a good authority on relief conditions in Europe, after the war, because he was in a position to know what the facts

LIBRARY

were; he did not form his judgment on the basis of the report of others.

Third, is the authority prejudiced? A prejudiced man sees evidence from one point of view only. He has some ideas of his own about the subject and looks for those facts that support his preconceived notions. What he wants to be the truth, he finds to be the truth, and so reports. Self-interest in arriving at a particular conclusion may be the motive that prompts him. This is the reason that we hesitate to accept the conclusions of a man who testifies upon a subject in which he has a financial interest. The testimony of the manager of a public utility that rates should be raised, because the margin of profit in the business is too small, is considered prejudiced testimony because that individual has a keen personal interest in the returns that would result from raising such rates. And the man who testifies may be honest in presenting his view. He may not consciously deceive anyone. Such is human nature, however, that man can not detach himself from that which interests him most. All this is not to point out that a prejudiced authority should not be consulted; he should be in many cases, but his judgments should be interpreted in the light of his inevitably prejudiced view.

Fourth, too much reliance should not be put on one authority. To do so is to weaken one's case. Where the judgment of one man only is presented, the inference may be made that the case cannot be very strong or more men would be supporting it. Every time a new authority is added, provided always that his testimony is reliable, added strength is given to the contention. This is true because, where we find sound principles as to policies, we find many strong minds supporting them and seeking for ways and means to make them effective. No single individual has a monopoly on wisdom.

Fifth, will the authority be accepted by those to whom the debater is presenting his argument? No matter how sound information and reasoning may be, in and of itself, nor how well supported by facts, they will not be impressive to an audience that does not have faith in the authority presenting them. For example, if an argument is to be presented to a group of laboring men, the speaker would make a mistake to support his contentions by citing the authority of a man known to be an antagonist to the labor movement. The farmers of the middle west would scarcely

hear with patience, to say nothing about being impressed by the testimony of a Wall Street banker. If we are wise, and wish to win our cause, we do not quote the Bible to a Mohammedan, nor do we quote the Koran to the Christian. To note this test, and to apply it to the evidence we use, is but to act in accordance with a common-sense view of human nature.

As the debater studies and investigates, how shall he collect the evidence? What form shall this selection take? Experience among debaters suggests that the card system is best. No detailed discussion can be given here; just a few suggestions. On cards, preferably the ordinary three-by-five filing card, or on slips of paper, let the student make notes of facts or quotations that he wishes to use to support his case; and also of the facts and quotations that may be used by opponents—this latter so that he may be in shape to refute the opposing case. Write on one side of card or paper only. This is an important detail because information is most usable when put in this form. Put a single piece of evidence only on each card; do not double up because these different pieces of evidence may be wanted for different parts of the discussion; where more than one note is on each card, shifting the cards about conveniently to get argument and evidence together becomes difficult.

Let the debater be careful to note on the card the name of the author quoted, the source from which the quotation came, the volume, the chapter, and the page. In short put everything on that card that it is necessary to have to make it possible for the debater, a month hence, to look up the citation again. Such review of the sources of evidence is often necessary because new points of view are constantly coming up as the argument develops and the notes already made may need to be enlarged and augmented. To be compelled to go back over a large portion of one's reading a second time, in order to find the source of one citation, is a loss of time and energy. A careful record of the first reading will make the review a simple matter.

V. FORMS THAT EVIDENCE MAY TAKE IN ARGUMENT

To discuss this phase of our subject completely would require much technical analysis and statement. Nothing like that can be attempted in a brief pamphlet like this. Some general observations can be made.

Generalization is the most frequently used form. A generalization is the statement of an inference that is drawn from the observation of many details of a class about which there are many features in common. All men use generalization to support their contentions without calling it by that name. For example, we may consider this sentence—United States senators are able men. This is a generalization arrived at after a knowledge of the ability and character of senators. Upon investigation it is found that most of them have wide information, the capacity to analyze and to think accurately, and, on the whole, are conscientious and earnest. Finding this out, the generalization is reached that United States senators are able men. The form here briefly suggested is used in a thousand situations in reasoning.

Whether or not generalizations are of value may be tested in different ways.

First, were the details of an observed class sufficient in number to warrant the generalization drawn? In human affairs it is not possible to know about all the possible details of a given class; not many of them can be found at a given time. But care must be exercised not to conclude too much from a few details. The danger is that the debater will find something true of one or two items of a class and jump to the conclusion that what is true of this one or two must be true of all. This is hasty and injudicious generalizing; the temptation of it is great and needs to be guarded against.

Second, are the details that have been examined, and upon which an inference is based, fair and typical specimens of the whole class? It is evident at once, as was formerly suggested, that, in any social question, all possible details can not be discovered. But this is not necessary, provided that the known details are fair and typical specimens of the class. Consider the example, used above, relative to the United States senators. It is not necessary that every senator's record should be checked to discover what he is, provided, however, that a fairly large proportion of typical senators are examined. When that is done, it is a fair inference to draw to think that what is true of these typical cases will be true of all.

Third, examination should be carefully made to see if there are exceptions. When a notable exception is found to the generalization, it ought to caution the debater about

being too sure of his position. One exception does not break a rule but it does weaken it. The discovery of such exception should urge the debater to go deeper into the subject to see if he can find so many of these, or such important ones, that his generalization is not to be trusted. For example, it is not unusual to meet the generalization that young people these days are a frivolous class, unlike the youth of other days. There are people who do not believe this. To them such a conclusion is based upon the observation of the actions of certain spectacular types who are much in the public eye but not so large in number. The generalization is not to be trusted because there are too many and too notable exceptions to it. Observed closely enough, the evidence is that, at heart, most modern young people are earnest and are seeking to develop in the best possible fashion. The exceptions are too many in this case to warrant the generalization.

Argument based upon analogy is another form into which the debater frequently casts his statement. Analogy is the inference that if two objects resemble each other in a few particulars, they will also resemble each other in some other particular point. This is an appealing form of argument. It is frequently used and often with telling effect. For example, consider the following illustration from a speech by Abraham Lincoln. Many men had urged a change of commanders in the Civil War. To them he replied:

"Gentlemen: I want you to suppose a case for a moment. Suppose all the property that you were worth was in gold, and you had put it in the hands of Blondin, the famous rope-walker, to carry across the Niagara Falls on a tight rope. Would you shake the rope while he was passing over it, or keep shouting to him, 'Blondin, stoop a little more! Go a little faster!'? No, I am sure you would not. You would hold your breath as well as your tongue, and keep your hand off until he was safely over. Now, the government is in the same situation. It is carrying an immense weight across a stormy ocean. Untold treasures are in its hands. It is doing the best it can. Don't badger it. Just keep still, and it will get you safely over."

The above is a fine example of the effective use of analogy. Its strength lies in the fact that the two cases or examples compared are similar on the special point or points about which there is contention. Its strength lies, further, in the fact that the form used adds to the clearness of the case that Lincoln desires to present. As an aid to clearness,

analogy is frequently useful; for, if the analogy be a good one, the comprehension of its significance is not difficult.

But a warning should be made at this point. An analogy may be deceptive. There may be resemblance between two examples on some points but not on the essential ones. It is here that careful testing of the statement must be made. And, furthermore, it should be observed that analogy alone is not to be relied upon as conclusive. When it can be used as an aid to other types of argument, it has great value. At best, two examples compared can make up but a small portion of any argument. Other aids are necessary, if a conclusive case is to be established.

Argument may, further, be developed by pointing out causes and effects. Technically, this form is called argument based on cause and effect, or effect to cause. Consider the latter. This is a popular method because there is always a disposition to seek for the causes of any effect that is noted. At first thought there may appear to be few difficulties here. This is hardly the truth; for causes are not always easy to discover. An alleged cause may not be the correct one simply because it appears, or is discoverable as existing before the effect. Causes of effects are often complex; many causes may be discovered. Prices of consumers' goods are high. It is a simple matter to say this effect was produced by the great war. But that is hardly satisfactory. For the great war was a complex condition of many causes and effects. The debater will need to be more specific; for him it will be necessary to point out the forces in detail that worked to produce the high prices.

Look at this form of argument from the other end, namely, cause to effect. The reformer gets enthusiastic for his reform, alleging that once it is brought about, such and such effects will result. Often his prediction is a true one. Often it is not. Those who wanted free silver in 1896 alleged that, if the gold standard was continued, as one political party advocated, the effect would be economic disaster to the country. The gold standard was continued, but the predicted effect did not follow. On the contrary, an era of business prosperity did come. Here was a case where debaters were arguing from cause to effect but made a great mistake as to the direction in which the cause would operate.

In judging whether or not the argument in this form is dependable, there are some tests that ought to be applied.

Is the alleged cause of an effect adequate to produce the effect? Mistakes may easily be made at this point unless the debater pauses to consider what the facts are. For example, it is not unusual to find the allegation made that the modern prevalence of crime in this country has been caused by watching crime in moving pictures. Is this cause sufficient to produce so great an effect? This is not the place to argue the question but, before the debater makes such a contention, he should make sure that his alleged cause could produce, by itself, such a result.

Again, the debater ought to raise another question by way of test. Can all other causes be so far eliminated as to leave only the alleged cause that could have produced the effect? Consider an illustration of this point. Since the war, attendance at colleges and universities has greatly increased; that is an effect. What is the cause? One answer that has been given is that the increase is due to the financial prosperity of the country. This may be a cause; but can one be sure that it is the only or even the chief cause? Other causes that may be mentioned are: first, that the lessons of the war showed that college training was important to enable men to get rapid promotion; second, that the complex times of these days demand the superior intellectual training that the college or university gives; the third, that for twenty-five years there has been a constant tendency to call for more and higher trained men in education and science and business so that the increasing numbers are a logical outgrowth of modern social movements. Now, as a matter of fact, all of these causes may have been operative; but certain it is that the debater would have great difficulty to show that the chief or only cause was financial prosperity after the war.

From the above, then, it becomes clear that, though this form of argument—cause to effect and effect to cause—is one frequently used, and effective in its use, care needs to be exercised by the debater to keep his facts straight, and not to claim more than the logic of the situation will bear.

VI. ORGANIZING THE EVIDENCE

Organization is a popular word in America. It is the key-note of the age, in education, in business, and in the social order. By organization as applied in debate is meant arranging the argument in such fashion as to make clear

all the parts in their relation to each other; the primary must be primary, the secondary must be secondary. What is principle should appear in the organization as such; and what is subordinate should appear as such. The importance of this, as a theory, may appear simple, but to get the organized product is by no means easy.

One of the difficulties exists because the debater frequently assumes that because an idea that he expresses is clear to himself, it is clear also to an audience of readers or hearers. This does not always follow. It is a case of forgetting the audience. The debater is familiar with his material; he has been a long time thinking it through and has gone over it many times. To a reader or hearer, it is likely to be fresh material. To meet the demands of this situation, careful organization of ideas can be brought to the aid of the debater.

Let us suppose a debate on a proposition that is to be supported by three main issues. Consideration need be given to but the first issue; the principles of organization will apply in the same way to the remaining issues. The first step is to make sure that the statement of the issue is clear and is vigorous. Re-statement may be required, under certain conditions, to make the presentation effective. Then follows the proof. For purposes of discussion, assume four lines of facts or evidence to be introduced as proof. State the first set of facts or subordinate points clearly but in such form that the supporting relationship to the main issue is clear. This will not be difficult. State now the second set of facts also bearing in mind how these facts are in supporting relationship to the main issue. This is a bit more difficult because the debater is a little farther removed from the main argumentative issue. Present the third set of subordinate facts. The problem of closely knit organization at this point grows harder because the distance between evidence offered and statement of issue to be proved has become longer. But the demand rests on the debater to keep the relationship clear and convincing. The presentation of the last piece of subordinate material requires considerable skill, due to remoteness of its statement from the statement of the issue that this evidence is to support.

The debater who can fit into such a situation as just outlined, can state his issue and then the four subordinate parts

of the proof, and at all times can keep the bearing of each part upon the other plain and easily understood, has mastered the basic principle of organization of debate material. He has, moreover, so massed his material that the audience may see and be impressed by the proof that is being offered.

The ability to do what has just been discussed was one of the secrets of Abraham Lincoln's success as a debater. In his great discussion entitled "Slavery as the Fathers Viewed It," the first thirty minutes of that speech are given to the presentation of one argumentative point. He states his issue clearly. Then follows the first piece of specific evidence. Before going on to the second bit of evidence, he pauses, in phrasing, to relate that evidence to the issue. Then he moves to the second line of evidence. After stating that, he calls attention to its relation to the issue. This process is followed through fifteen steps as the argument moves forward. It is impossible for the hearer or reader to be lost as to the significance of the various items of the subordinate parts of the argument. The organization is completely unified. If Lincoln, with all his power, found it was necessary to organize so carefully, his plan is a good model for any student.

What is said in the above about the single issue and its development, holds true of all the issues and the entire debate. Such organization means that clearness, forcefulness and impressiveness are obtained.

VII. FINAL EXPRESSION IN LANGUAGE

A good statement may make an ordinary argument effective; a poor statement may mar the force of a strong argument. Words are symbols; phrases and sentences are just larger symbols of ideas. Words are not used for their own sake; they are used to express ideas. The debater who expects to be impressive, therefore, must be a close student of final expression in language.

Simplicity is the standard. Striving for so-called eloquence usually defeats itself. The result is high sounding rhetoric, filled with vague meanings and generalities, leaving no single, definite impression as to just what the debater had in mind. This idea can be no better explained than by an illustration from the debating of Abraham Lincoln. The following is a paragraph, or part of a paragraph.

taken from his speech "Slavery as the Fathers Viewed It." In speaking to the South, he said:

"You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do not repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is not ours; but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to the discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet us as if it were possible that something may be said on our side."

Here is an admirable statement of argument. The words are simple. There are few, if any, of them that are not in the vocabulary of the average man. There is no attempt to choose the sonorous word—the speaker is too much interested in making his point clear to use any but commonly used words. The phrases, moreover, and the sentences are short and direct, each containing a brief thought unit. There is a steady, continuous movement in the thought, each step a short one but a step ahead. The organization is almost perfect, for each idea that comes grows out of, and is dependent upon, what has gone before. Such a style is easily understood and, because so plain and cumulative in statement, is impressive and persuasive.

There is, furthermore, the element of patience and self-control in this style. Lincoln might have ridiculed the South; he did not, though the temptation must have been great. He might have used the biting, sarcastic word; yet there is nothing but sane, sensible, and even sympathetic argument; argument that is none-the-less strong, even though restrained.

These elements, then, of directness, simplicity, clearness, force, self-control, steady movement forward to the end, and close organization, are the characteristics of final statement that the young debater should seek to make his own.

VIII. ORAL EXPRESSION OF THE ARGUMENT

Why have oral discussions anyway? Why not write out what is to be contended for, and let the audience read the thought? The answer is, because there is an effectiveness in the presentation of thought, through the medium of voice and personality, that is missed when the manuscript only is read. The use of the voice, vocal emphasis, inflection, emotional power, in short the whole personality, add something to the thought of the debater. That is why men lecture and preach and why audiences are eager to listen.

When he was characterizing the platform methods of Wendell Phillips, the abolition agitator and orator, George William Curtis said of him: "He is a gentleman conversing." No better descriptive phrase could be used of the effective speaker; he converses on this subject, while the audience listens. Can the term conversation be used of the manner of the public speaker? Yes, if we bear in mind that the method of the public platform utterance is simply the conversational method, as between earnest individuals, enlarged to meet the demands of the size of the audience. The speaker talks to his audience, reasons with them, he does not declaim to them, nor does he roar at them. True it is, that the young debater may have some difficulty in making this enlarged conversation natural and his own; but once it is adopted, as a standard of oral manner, constant effort and practice will ultimately attain it.

Then there is the matter of emphasis. All facts and all thoughts are not of equal value in argument. Those that are most prominent ought to be made prominent in the oral delivery. This is the very common place of expression; yet it is disregarded in debating as often as any other element. Men speak their words and sentences, and point out their facts, in the manner of dead-level monotony.

Closely allied with emphasis is the element of variety. Emphasis is contrast; and we point out contrasts by the use of ways and means of getting variety. The chief methods of obtaining variety lie in change of style, of rate of utterance, of force or volume of voice, of pitch, of pause, and

of quality of voice. Most American people know what these terms mean; but our speaking is not characterized by their use as aids, because no attempt has been made to develop skill in their use. All that can be attempted here is to draw attention to them and to their importance, pointing out that there can be no pleasing and impressive oral expression, in debate or other forms of spoken address, unless the speaker develops facility in their use.

IX. REFUTATION, OR MEETING CONTENTIONS OF OPPONENTS

Debating usually presumes that there will be one or more speakers on opposite sides of a proposition. In such case, the debater attempts to meet and to overthrow the arguments advanced by the opposition. Refutation consists in discovering the errors in the reasoning, or the mis-use of facts, or the failure to support argument with adequate reasons and facts. Skill in refutation requires information about both sides of the argument. In destroying the contentions of opponents, the debater points out how there has been a contention made that is based on hasty generalization, mistaken cause and effect, false analogy, or unjustifiable inferences from facts.

In refutation, there are some guiding principles that ought to be observed.

First, if one is to be clear, in his position, for his audience, considerable care must be used to state exactly and fully what point it is that is being refuted; a half statement or a hint will not do, because audiences unfamiliar with the debater's point of view will not understand. To make a mis-step here is to defeat what follows, for the significance of the latter will not be clear, no matter how strong it may be in and of itself.

Second, the refutation of the point under consideration should not be just contradicted, as though the speaker said, "That's not true." Adequate reasons and facts for the contention must be presented. In other words, a sketchy refutation is but little better than none at all. The point must be held up to view long enough, and the opposing facts massed in sufficient quantity to impress the hearer with the strength of the speaker's contention and the weakness of the opponent's argument. This is simple enough in theory

but often, more often than not, disregarded in practice by young debaters.

Third, in so far as possible the debater should confine his refutation to the principal contentions of the opposition. The principle of selection should guide. Time is easily wasted on little or subordinate points, when, if a careful selection of the important point or two is made, and an adequate answer is presented, the small arguments will fall with this important one. To accomplish this demands of the debater real powers of rapid analysis and judgment, while the opposition speaks; it demands, further, such complete preparation on the subject that the reasoning and facts will be at hand to be used in reply.

Fourth, in so far as it is possible, the debater should introduce the points that he intends to refute at the same time and along with his own constructive case. This can not always be done, but, when possible, the opportunity is at hand to throw the mass of facts, used in the constructive case, directly against the contentions of the opponent. Two objects are reached; the constructive case is built up, as was planned, and the opponent's case is weakened.

Fifth, frequently debaters leave refutation until after they have presented their constructive argument. Two things ought to be remembered about this. Unless the debater is confident that he can completely and satisfactorily destroy the case of the opposition, this is a dangerous position for refutation. The repetition of an opponent's argument calls it to the mind of the hearer. Unless, then, the answer is complete, the effect is unsatisfactory. If upon the other hand, the facts are in command of the debater, and his reasoning is so strong that he can completely demolish the opponent's point of view, this final position for refutation has some advantages.

X. ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT OF DEBATERS

What shall be the attitude of the debater toward his subject and his opportunity? Certainly it should be one of utmost earnestness and sincerity. A flippant attitude will surely defeat the disciplinary ends for which debating exists at all. Even though one were to debate for the sheer fun of the game, as students in England say they do, the principle would still hold true. Fun, as an end, would have to be taken seriously, if anything were to be accomplished in

it. In America our point of emphasis is different. Our object is to get training, to develop powers. The debater then will need to take his work earnestly and determine to get the most possible out of it.

What shall be the attitude of the debater toward his opponents? Courtesy is the keynote. Without this virtue, a bad impression is made. The purpose of the debater is to make his argument impressive to his hearers. How unfortunate then to exhaust the patience, and sense of fair-play of his audience, by being discourteous to the opposition. Just this is often done; it can and ought to be avoided.

Furthermore, he is a happy debater who takes his opponent's case seriously, giving full weight to what is said. Even arguments that, because of a debater's familiarity with the material, may not seem strong or may appeal to him as being unfair, often strike an audience otherwise. To make the most out of his position, therefore, the debater does well to consider carefully and earnestly what the opposition offers. He is in a much safer argumentative position, when he does so. Courtesy and consideration may be made to go hand-in-hand with force and impressiveness.

XI. SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF GROUPS

The foregoing pages present a brief discussion of some principles of argumentation and debating. Group leaders should make use of them only as guiding suggestions. Their usefulness will depend upon the leader's ability to interpret, where interpretation is needed, and his ability to amplify, where amplification is important.

Developing a debate, and debating on the basis of such principles, involve certain practical steps. Among them is the selection of debaters. This is often perplexing.

One of the first considerations is the matter of time. For how long can the discussion be held, half an hour, an hour, an hour and a half, what? This time element is a factor in the number of speakers that can be used on each team. No rule can be stated that will govern the number of speakers. Conditions and the leader's wish control that.

If the debaters are young, and with little or no experience, the length of time allotted to each should be short. Five or six minutes is adequate. If the debaters are more mature, and with some confidence, gained from experience, a longer time may be assigned, ten to twelve minutes per-

haps. The leader must use his own judgment in such matters.

Under circumstances where the leader is confronted with the problem of selecting a few debaters from a large number of prospects, he may find it necessary to hold a preliminary try-out to select his teams; unless, of course, he has the liberty and the authority to make his own selections. In that case his problem is simplified.

In conducting a preliminary try-out, the usual procedure is to use the question that has been chosen for the final debate. The speakers are allowed to select, for this try-out, the affirmative or negative. Or, if the leader chooses, he may assign the debaters to one or the other side of the discussion. As a rule the former procedure is preferred, because it gives each speaker a little more independence and confidence. A few days is given to preparation for this try-out.

On the occasion of the preliminary debate each speaker is allowed a few minutes, four or five, to present his case, while a group of judges, or a judge, listen. After each speaker is heard on the constructive argument, a chance is given every one for refutation. The time for refutation should be about half as long as is given to the constructive case. When the speaking is over the judges, or the judge, give their decision, selecting the team or teams with whatever number of speakers desired.

Preliminary debates, for the purpose of selecting debaters, are not altogether satisfactory; but no one has been able to devise a better system. If the leader is given the opportunity to have his training extend over considerable time, he may avoid any preliminaries by holding several debates, thus giving to all a chance to get experience and to have the pleasure that any debating contest brings.

The teams being selected and the time for each speaker allotted, what follows? The team or teams must be given their speaking order, as first, second, and third affirmative, or first, second and third negative, etc. To each debater is assigned a definite argumentative function to perform. This assignment is not made arbitrarily but logically as the issues of the question develop.

When the time for the final discussion comes, the customary procedure is followed. The first affirmative opens the discussion. The first negative follows. He, in turn,

is followed by the second affirmative, and so on to the conclusion of the constructive cases.

The usual procedure is for the first negative speaker to open the refutation argument, to be followed by the first affirmative, and so on alternately until all the speakers have had a chance in rebuttal argument. It is not, of course, necessary for the order of speakers to be the same in refutation as it was in the constructive case. The leader, or the debaters, may wish a different arrangement. Usually the strongest speaker closes the case for each team.

In conducting the debates, either the preliminary or the final, each speaker should be given a warning signal, when his time is about to expire. In cases where five or six minutes is given for the presentation of the argument, the signal should be given one minute before final time is called. In cases where ten to twelve minutes is allowed for the speaker, the warning notification should be given two minutes before the expiration of the debater's time. This arrangement is desirable so that the speaker may have a chance to make his final presentation as complete and as well summarized as is possible.

Some leaders may not favor a discussion quite so formal and rigid as the one just outlined. Objection is often made against the formal debate because speakers are asked to argue on a given side of a question, regardless of their convictions or their desires. Such discussion, it is contended, hampers freedom and independence of thought.

Where a leader, or the debaters, think the formal debate is undesirable, they need not follow it. They may adopt, as is often done, the less formal type. For example, a question may be selected and the speakers allowed to select whatever side of it they desire. If it is a good question, there is little likelihood that all speakers will take the same side, though there may be an uneven division as to numbers.

Consider an illustration. Suppose you have eight debaters. Five of them may want to speak affirmatively and three negatively. Let them do so. Conduct the discussion this way: First one affirmative speech, then one negative, to be followed by two affirmatives, then another negative, followed by two affirmatives, giving the negative the close. The refutation can be conducted in much the same way.

In this form the speakers may be free to choose their own manner of presenting the arguments. There may be some, or even considerable, repetition. What is lost in

duplication, however, may be more than gained by giving each speaker freedom to develop his case as he desires. Interest and development are what leaders want. No two speakers are likely to use exactly the same arguments. And if they did, they would not adopt the same evidence as proof; nor would they present their cases in identical forms or language.

The leader, if he is intellectually alive and original, can find various ways and means of his own to apply the suggestions made in the foregoing outlined plans.

To what practical use, in terms of social service, can the results of debating be put by the leader? At this point he has a real responsibility. There are a few ideas that he can keep constantly before the group he is directing.

First, he may point out that the intellectual work done to get at the truth of a question, for argumentative discussion, is the same type of thinking that must be given to discover the essential facts, as they apply to any question in civic, social, political, religious, or educational affairs.

Second, he may emphasize that the accuracy, needed for the correct interpretation of issues and evidence in debating, is the type of accuracy that is needed by the leaders of society everywhere.

Third, attention can be drawn to the importance of patience and tolerance toward the judgments and evidence of others in the debate, and the point can be made that these qualities constitute the very essence of the Christian virtues needed in passing judgment on the actions of others, whenever and wherever met.

This list could be made much longer, but enough has been outlined to suggest how the debate, as an exercise, can be employed to build good taste, intellectual discipline, and a sense of fairness in the growing man or woman.

XII. SAMPLE BRIEF OF DEBATE

Question: The Philippine Islands should not at present be given self government.

THE AFFIRMATIVE

Introduction

The history of the Philippine Islands from the beginning of Spanish rule up to the present time is a long story of wars, turmoil, discontent, and unsettled conditions. The facts show this to be true, in that:

A. During the Spanish rule there were one hundred uprisings great and small.

B. In 1890, the Filipinos revolted against the rule of Spain.

C. With help of America in 1898 the Filipinos threw off the authority of the Spanish rule and

1. An American civil government was established.
2. The Filipino was encouraged to learn how to govern himself as rapidly as he could.

D. Under Governor-General Harrison in 1913 the government was practically in the hands of the Filipino, with results that were not encouraging.

E. In 1921 Governor-General Wood found it necessary to take a strong hand to bring back good order and economy in government administration.

F. The Filipinos are not content with the government as it is, and insist that the only solution is complete independence of the United States.

Issues

The issues that arise from a consideration of the facts as outlined in this brief history of the situation, as to the relationship between the Philippine Islands and the United States on the point of independence, may be briefly stated as follows:

First. Are the Filipinos sufficiently developed by experience, growth, and information to govern themselves?

Second. Are the Filipinos capable of conducting the financial affairs of their government?

Third. Can the Filipinos protect themselves against the aggrandizement and exploitation of other powers?

Proof

1. The Filipinos are not sufficiently developed to form and to conduct a government of their own, for

a. Too large a percentage of the population is yet uninformed about political affairs, for

(1) Jeremiah J. Jenks, President of Alexander Hamilton Institute of New York, in "The World Tomorrow" (Feb. 1927) states: "The Filipinos are an ignorant people. The newspapers in English, Spanish, or dialects are read by one hundred and fifty thousand people out of twelve millions. They get their information only from politicians."

(2) Robert Lansing, former Secretary of State has said: "Because of the present minority of educated people in the Philippine Islands, any independent government, based on principles of democracy, would necessarily fall into the hands of a few individuals. In the past oligarchies have not been conducive to the general welfare of the people, the majority of whom do not possess intellectual development necessary to conduct a popular government, and there is no evidence that the Philippine Islands will be an exception to the rule." *Review of Reviews*—August, 1927.

b. About ninety-three per cent of the population is unenergetic and with little aptitude for business or politics, for

It is pure-blooded Malay with no experience in conducting political affairs on any basis that has given training to fit the Filipino to cope with the competition of the rest of the world—a competition that he would have to meet, if he made any attempt to conduct his own government.

c. A single generation is too short a time in which to develop in any people the capacity to understand what to do with power, when it is placed in their hands, for

The history of the world demonstrates that no people has been able to learn how to govern itself in one generation, for the English, the French, the American people could not do it.

2. The Filipinos are not as yet capable of conducting the financial affairs of their government, for

a. Past history shows this, for

(1) When the Philippine National Bank was turned over to the Filipinos, it was mismanaged, for its losses amounted to $37,544,500. It had been operated "in violation of every principle which prudence, intelligence or even honesty could dictate."

(2) Ralston Hayden, formerly Exchange Professor at the University of the Philippines, said: (Cong. Digest, April 1924, P. 234) "The inefficiency and dishonesty in the management of the National fiscal system had resulted in a loss of more than $22,000,000 of public money."

b. Government finance is complex, demanding experience, and calling for men of the highest genius in knowing how to obtain money in taxes and then how to spend wisely. There is no evidence that the Filipinos have these qualifications.

c. As yet the Filipinos have no great funds of accumulated capital to support their government, for

(1) The great source of their capital at present is found in the American people.

(2) They must continue, for some years, perhaps even generations, to obtain this American capital, a thing they would find difficult to do were the national finances entirely in their own hands.

3. The Filipinos are not capable of self-government because they can not protect themselves against the aggrandizement and exploitation of greater powers, for

a. They constitute a territory whose resources are much desired by certain of the commercial nations of the world, for

(1) In the Islands can be found one third of the world's cocoanuts.

(2) The daily output of sugar is about 26,840 tons.

(3) Here are some of the world's richest mines of gold, iron, and coal.

(4) Vast quantities of rubber, hemp, coffee, and other tropical commodities can be produced.

(5) There are vast supplies of forest products.

b. They are not favorably situated geographically for

(1) There are more than three thousand islands, hence scattered and with vast coast lines.

(2) They lie in the direct line of the world's trade between Occident and Orient.

(3) They are easily open to attack from Japan who looks with ambitious eyes at their resources.

c. There are some forty-three different ethnographic groups or tribes, speaking some eighty-seven different dialects, making it impossible to have unity of sentiment and purpose among them, for

(1) The Christian groups are opposed to the Moros, who are Mohammedans.

(2) And the Mohammedan Moros are not willing to unite with the Christians.

d. They have no army, no navy, nor do they have the military leadership nor the financial resources to build adequate means of national defense, if they were placed in possession of their own government and the aid of the United States were to be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Bearing in mind then that the Filipinos are not yet sufficiently developed by experience or information, remembering that they have not learned how to conduct the fiscal affairs of the nation, and keeping in mind also the fact that the Islands are not so situated, or so strong, that they could defend themselves against an ambitious invader, it becomes clear that they ought not, at least in this generation, to be given the responsibility of self-government.

THE NEGATIVE

Introduction

In this discussion the negative agrees with the affirmative that the Philippine Islands have been restless, discontented, and often at war, since the beginning of Spanish rule. The negative agrees also that the affirmative has stated the issues, with one exception, upon which a decision must be reached as to whether or not the Filipinos should be granted self-government. That single exception is that the United States is under moral obligation, because of its pledges to the Islands, to grant them independence. That is the first proposition that will be discussed.

Proof

1. The Filipinos should be granted self-government because the United States has given them that assurance, for

a. President McKinley stated, when the Islands were taken from Spain, that it was our avowed policy to prepare them for independence.

b. President Roosevelt declared that independence to be the ultimate aim of his party, and that the policies that controlled his party's action toward these Islands, should have no other aim.

c. President Taft said: "The end of all our endeavors must be to give the Filipinos self-government and by this I mean independence, if they desire it."

d. President Coolidge, in a statement in the Current History Magazine for April, 1924, said, "If the time comes when it is apparent that independence would be better for the people of the Philippines, from the point of view of both their domestic concerns and their status in the world, and if, when that time comes, the Filipino people desire complete independence, it is not possible to doubt that the American government and people will gladly accord it."

e. There has never been a time, when the American people have had any desire other than to give the Islands their independence.

f. The only Americans who have expressed a different desire have been certain commercial interests that wish to exploit the Islands for private gain, which they think can be more easily done under American rule than under a Filipino self-governing regime.

2. The Filipinos should be given their independence because they are capable of self-government, for

a. They are an homogeneous people, for they are more homogeneous than the American people themselves, for they all belong to the Malay stock. Seven and one half million belong to the Catholic Church.

b. They have made great progress in their development in recent years, for

(1) President Harding said that their progress is "without parallel anywhere in the world."

(2) President Wilson, in his message to Congress on December 2, 1920 said: "Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf and have thus fulfilled the condition set by Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the Islands."

c. They have the educational qualifications, for

(1) The literacy of the Filipinos above ten years of age was fifty-four per cent in 1918, and in 1924 was over sixty per cent—a record in growth that is hard to duplicate in any country.

(2) They have nearly 8,000 public schools.

(3) The attendance at the University of the Philippines is over 5,000.

(4) The enrollment in the public schools during the school year of 1923-24 was over 1,112,000.

(5) In 1913 there were only eight public hospitals, while in 1921 there were twenty-two.

3. The Filipinos are capable of conducting the financial affairs of their government, for

a. The Filipino government, under the influence of the Filipinos themselves, adopted the budget system even before it was adopted in the United States, for these people realized the governmental finances should be run on a basis of system.

b. The Filipinos have solved the problem of co-operation between the legislature and department heads by providing that the secretaries may appear before the legislature to be questioned on the floor on public matters; and by creating what is known as the Council of State to discuss the larger questions of policy.

c. Under the direction of the Filipinos exports have grown from four and one half to twenty-three millions of dollars, thus indicating their power to develop financial interests.

d. They are in a position to raise large sums of money, when there is need for it, for

(1) They now have the lowest tax rate in the world among important commercial people.

(2) They have many sources of taxation when they find need to use them.

4. The Filipinos can take care of themselves in their relations with other nations, if they are once given the chance, for

a. They are strategically located for this purpose, for it is to the interests of all the great nations to keep them independent, for they are on the trade routes of the world where open markets are the most to be desired.

b. Japan, the most likely enemy, would not attack, for Australia would object. England would object because of the effect on her trade routes. The Japanese people want no war with any nation over the Philippine Islands.

c. Though there are many Islands, this fact makes them difficult to attack, to conquer and to hold, for the coast lines are long and difficult of approach.

d. The Filipinos are developing a sense of solidarity and patriotism that will make them united and determined to protect their rights, for

(1) Even the Moros are jealous of the rights of the Islands.

(2) The schools are teaching the Filipino to look upon himself as an individual able and determined to protect his dearest rights.

Conclusion

To summarize the negative case, the facts indicate that the United States is under moral obligation to give the Islands their independence; that the Filipinos are sufficiently developed to govern themselves; that they have learned how to organize the finances of their country; and that they can protect themselves against the desire for exploitation from ambitious neighbors. The right, the ability, and the ambition to be a self-governing people belong to the Filipinos and the United States should give them the independence they so much desire.

XIII. QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE

Any further centralization of power in the federal government of the United States should be condemned.

Lobbying in Congress and in state legislature should be prohibited by law.

Congress should provide for uniform marriage and divorce laws. Constitutionality conceded.

All cities of over 5,000 inhabitants should adopt the city manager plan of government.

The federal government should own and operate the telephone and telegraph systems.

The United States should own and operate the coal mines.

The forests of the United States should be protected by the federal government from further exploitation by private interests.

The amount of property transferable by inheritance should be limited by law.

The United States should carry out a policy of disarmament.

The federal government should, through a system of pensions, take care of the aged and infirm.

Sunday baseball should be prohibited.

Violation of the Eighteenth Amendment should be regarded as treason by the United States government.

All cities of over fifteen thousand population should establish free public employment bureaus.

State institutions should be established providing for the care and training of homeless children.

Congress should enact laws providing for the censorship of the stage.

Popular literature shows a decline in public morals.

Social settlement organizations offer the best means of conducting charitable work.

No college should be located near a large city.

Segregation of sexes in American colleges and universities is preferable to co-education.

Cuba should be annexed to the United States.

The President should be elected by direct vote of the people.

Compulsory manual training should be introduced into all grammar and high schools.

Athletics are being excessively developed in high schools and colleges.

Roman Catholics, and members of other religious sects, are justified in establishing parochial schools.

Municipalities should own and operate public plants for the furnishing of light.

Bus lines in American cities should be substituted for street car systems.

The regular courses of study in high schools and colleges should be further modified in the interest of those desiring to fit themselves for practical business careers.

High schools and colleges should be operated for the entire year instead of for nine months.

There should be a union of Protestant churches.

In churches there should be more emphasis placed on social service as an end to be attained.

Is the church, as an institution, on the decline?

Is membership in any church important for the most complete individual development?

School boards should furnish text books for all public and high school courses.

All judges of state courts should be appointed by the executive, and hold office during life or good behavior.

The students in ——— high school should have self-government.

The national capital should be moved to a more central location.

Too many students are attending colleges and universities.

Interscholastic football games should be abolished.

The speed of automobiles should be held to twenty miles per hour or less in all towns and cities.

The suffrage should require an educational qualification.

Compulsory voting should be introduced by all state governments. Independent political action is preferable to party loyalty, as a means of securing reform.

Eight hours should be the standard time for a day's work.

Separate high schools should be established for boys and girls.

College and high school fraternities and sororities are more harmful than beneficial.

Is there a growing indifference to church-going in the United States?

The advertisement of patent medicines should be prohibited by law.

A declaration of war should be made only by popular vote.

Freshmen should not be received into college fraternities.

Labor unions are justified in striking to prevent the employment of non-union laborers.

The cities of the United States should own and operate their street-railway systems.

The church should become the social center for its community.

Life imprisonment is preferable to capital punishment.

The study of the Bible, as part of regular work in public schools, ought to be required.

Vivisection, involving pain, should be prohibited by law.

The Philippine Islands should be given their independence.

The emphasis in education of negroes in America should be industrial rather than liberal.

Military drill should be compulsory in public high schools.

The President of the United States should be elected for a single term of six years.

Postmasters should be elected by popular vote.

The labor of children, under fifteen years of age, should be prohibited by federal law.

The tendency of population to concentrate in the cities of the United States is detrimental to the best interests of the people.

The wages of men and women should be the same for the same work.

Social functions which involve lavish expense are unjustifiable.

All church, college, and university property should be taxed.

The "honor system" should be adopted for all examinations in ——— high school.

The city of ——— should build a municipal auditorium.

Public libraries, museums, and art galleries should be open on Sunday.

Public libraries should not circulate novels until two years after publication.

For the average man a college education is an aid to success in business.

The number of subjects taught in high schools and colleges should be greatly reduced.

Night schools should be established as a part of our system of public education.

The Oxford type of university should be adopted in the United States.

The direct primary system of nominating candidates for public office in the United States should be abolished.

Modern advertising is harmful to the consumer.

It was easier for young people of a century ago to be Christian than it is today.

Denominationalism is a detriment to the spread of Christianity.

Fraternalism among races is harmful and dangerous to all concerned.

The church expects too much of its young people today.

The church has no right to concern itself with problems of labor and industry.

The church should not meddle in politics.

A scientific attitude is necessary to an adequate knowledge of the Bible today.

There is a difference between the "so called Christian calling" and the business and professional vocations.

Church membership and attendance are necessary to live a Christian life.

Christianity is the only true religion.

The home should have first call on the time of youth.

The church should have first call on the time of youth.

The school should have first call on the time of youth.

It is better to choose and aim toward some vocation early in life and change your choice several times than to wait until college to choose.

Christianity has more bearing on individual religious problems than on problems of social living.

The best way out of difficulties is to follow the advice of parents. (Teachers) (Adults).

There is a Christian standard for boy and girl relationships.

The "Golden Rule" should be practiced in business and industry.

The ten commandments are as binding today as they were in the days of Moses.

We should solve our problem of immigration by deportation rather than Americanization.

The Oriental seclusion act is unjust economically and racially.

It is a greater handicap to be born black than a "blend" in America.

The present dominant position of the white race is due primarily to the fact that it is a superior race.

China has the same right to send an army to the United States in order to protect Chinese interests, that America has to send an army to China to protect American interests.

The only possible solution of the race problem is amalgamation.

Confiscation of private wealth in time of war would help to prevent war.

REFERENCE BOOKS

Lyon, Leverett S., "Elements of Debating," University of Chicago Press..$1.25

In this book the elements of debating are presented in a brief form and in simple discussion. It is a good book for beginners because it is not complex in treatment of the subject.

Thomas, Ralph W., "A Manual of Debate," American Book Company $1.00

This book is also an elementary discussion but a valuable one. In the book a number of questions are stated and outlined for discussion as models.

Foster, William T., "Argumentation and Debating," (Revised Edition), Houghton Mifflin Company $2.00

This is a larger book than the first two named, is more thorough in its discussion and meets the needs for more advanced work. It is one of the most widely used college texts on the subject of debating.

O'Neill, J. M., Laycock, C., and Scales, R. L., "Argumentation and Debate," Macmillan Company $2.10

A thorough book; for advanced students and for reference. A teacher or leader ought to consult this text because of its complete treatment of certain phases of debating and argumentation.

FURTHER TRAINING FOR LEADERS OF YOUTH

The successful leader of youth is continually growing in leadership capacity. Therefore, it is suggested that, in addition to the diligent use of these materials and of others that may supplement and enrich them from time to time, the devoted and ambitious leader will avail himself or herself of some of the following opportunities for further equipment in leadership:

(1) **The Standard Leadership Training Curriculum** developed co-operatively by thirty-nine denominations in North America. Many of the best leaders cover two units of this course each year in local church, community, or summer schools. Full information can be secured from the denominational headquarters, state or provincial offices, or the International Council of Religious Education.

(2) **Reading of Books.** The lists given in these materials will help. "A book a month" is the purpose of many.

(3) **Reading of Magazines.** All leadership journals issued by the denomination should be used. The International Journal of Religious Education serves the thirty-nine denominations co-operatively (5 South Wabash Ave., Chicago, Illinois).

(4) **Conferences, conventions, and leadership institutes.** Information as to these can be secured from denominational, state, and provincial headquarters.

(5) **Workers' conferences in the local school.**

(6) **Summer schools and summer training camps and conferences.** These are conducted widely throughout the continent by denominations, co-operative councils, and the International Council of Religious Education. Full information can be secured by writing the headquarters concerned.

NATIONAL DENOMINATIONAL OFFICES

Offices of denominations affiliated with the International Council

Advent Christian, 160 Warren St., Boston, Mass.
African Methodist Episcopal, 8th and Lea Aves., Nashville, Tenn.
African Methodist Episcopal, Zion, 438 E. 46th St., Chicago, Ill.
Baptist, Maritime Provinces, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.
Baptist, Ontario and Quebec, 99 Dundee St. E., Toronto, Ontario, Can.
Baptist, Northern (Amer. Bapt. Pub. Soc.), 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Baptist, Natl. Conv., Inc., (Col.), 4th Ave. and Cedar St., Nashville, Tenn.
Baptist, Natl. Conv., Uninc. (Col.), 523 Second Ave., Nashville, Tenn.
Baptist, Seventh Day, Milton Junction, Wisconsin.
Brethren Church, Ashland, Ohio.
Brethren, Church of the, Gen. S. S. Board, Elgin, Ill.
Christian Church, Christian Pub. Assn., Dayton, Ohio.
Christian Reformed Church, 737 Madison Ave. S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Church of God, Anderson, Indiana.
Church of the Nazarene, 2923 Troost Ave., Kansas City, Mo.
Congregational, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Cumberland Presbyterian, Box 542, Nashville, Tenn.
Disciples of Christ, College of Missions Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
Evangelical Church, 1903 Woodland Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.
Evangelical Synod of North America, 2013 St. Louis Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Friends, 101 S. 8th St., Richmond, Ind.
Mennonite Brethren in Christ, Goshen, Ind.
Methodist Episcopal, 740 Rush St., Chicago, Ill.
Methodist Episcopal, South, 810 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
Methodist, Free, 1132 Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
Methodist Protestant, 3437 Piedmont Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Methodist, Wesleyan, 330 E. Onondaga St., Syracuse, N. Y.
Methodist Episcopal Colored, 123 Fourteenth Ave. N., Nashville, Tenn.
Presbyterian, U. S. A., 423 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
Presbyterian, U. S., Box 1176, Richmond, Va.
Presbyterian Church (Canada), 128-320 Bay St., Toronto, Canada.
Presbyterian, United, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Protestant Episcopal (National Council), 281 Fourth Ave., New York City.
Reformed Church in America, 25 E. 22nd St., New York City.
Reformed Church in the U. S., Schaff Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
United Brethren, U. B. Building, Dayton, Ohio.
United Brethren, Old Constitution, 205 U. B. Bldg., Huntington, Ind.
United Church of Canada, 299 Queen St., West Toronto, Ontario, Can.
United Lutheran Church, 1228 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.

STATE AND PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OFFICES

Alabama, 424 Age-Herald Bldg., Birmingham.
British Columbia, 401 Pacific Building, Vancouver.
California (North), 3 City Hall Ave., San Francisco.
California (South), 626 W. M. Garland Bldg., Los Angeles.
Colorado, 302 Trinity Bldg., Denver.
Connecticut, 18 Asylum St., Hartford.
Georgia, 222 Hurt Bldg., Atlanta.
Idaho, 429 Peyton Bldg., Spokane, Wash.
Illinois, 130 N. Wells St., Chicago.
Indiana, 729 Occidental Bldg., Indianapolis.
Iowa, 403 Youngerman Block, Des Moines.
Kansas, 923 Kansas Ave., Topeka.
Kentucky, 712 Louisville Trust Bldg., Louisville.
Louisiana, 1008 Maison-Blanche Bldg., New Orleans.
Maine, Press Herald Building, Portland.
Manitoba, 205 Huron and Erie Bldg., Winnipeg.
Maritime Provinces, 94 Prince William St., St. John, N. B.
Maryland, 508 Morris Bldg., Baltimore.
Massachusetts, Rm. 609, 1 Beacor St., Boston.
Michigan, 232 S. Capitol Ave., Lansing.
Minnesota, 516 Midland Trust Bldg. St. Paul.
Mississippi, P. O. Box 123, Jackson.
Missouri, 4660 Maryland Ave., St Louis.
Nebraska, 509 Little Bldg., Lincoln.
New Hampshire, 806 Amoskeag Bank Bldg., Manchester.
New Jersey, 19 William St., Newark.
New York, 80 Howard St., Albany.
North Carolina, 612 Odd Fellows Bldg., Raleigh.
North Dakota, Rm. 311, 117 Broadway, Fargo.
Ohio, 307 E. Gay St., Columbus.

Oklahoma, 732 W. 21st St., Oklahoma City.
Ontario, 504 Wesley Bldg., Toronto.
Oregon, 310 Y. M. C. A. Bldg., Portland.
Pennsylvania, 1511 Arch St., Philadelphia.
Quebec, 216 Coronation Bldg., Montreal.
Rhode Island, 629 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence.
Saskatchewan, Westman Chambers, Regina.
South Carolina, 9-11 Montgomery Trust Bldg., Spartanburg.
South Dakota, Parker.
Tennessee, Fayetteville.
Texas, 407 Marvin Bldg., Dallas.
Vermont, 455 Shelburne Road, Burlington.
Virginia, P. O. Box 110, Bridgewater.
Washington (East), 429 Peyton Bldg., Spokane.
Washington (West), 529 Burke Bldg., Seattle.
West Virginia, 422 Moore Building, Charleston.
Wisconsin, 179 Main St., Oshkosh.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF YOUTH

From the Educational Commission of the International Council of Religious Education

J. M. Artman, General Secretary, Religious Education Association.
Arlo A. Brown, President, Chattanooga University, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Lawrence Johnson, Director of Religious Education, First Presbyterian Church, Evanston, Ill.
Cynthia Pearl Maus, Superintendent of Young People's Work, Disciples of Christ.

From Young People's Work Professional Advisory Section of the International Council

E. H. Bonsall, Jr., Superintendent, Young People's Division, Pennsylvania State Sunday-school Association.
Sherwood Gates, Superintendent of Intermediate-Senior and Young People's Work, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
Frank D. Getty, Director of Young People's Work, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.
Warren T. Powell, Superintendent of Young People's Work, Methodist Episcopal Church.

Members at Large

Mary R. Allison, Girls' Work Secretary, United Church of Canada.
E. P. Gates, General Secretary, International Society of Christian Endeavor.
Zelah Heinbaugh, National Board of Y. W. C. A.
Abel J. Gregg, National Council of Y. M. C. A.
Blaine E. Kirkpatrick, General Secretary, Epworth League of Methodist Episcopal Church.
Edwin Phelps, General Secretary, Baptist Young People's Union of America.
Fred A. Repogle, Superintendent, Young People's Division, Michigan Council of Religious Education.
Morris C. Robinson, Assistant Editor Intermediate-Senior Publications, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

From Staff of the International Council of Religious Education

Percy R. Hayward, Director of Young People's Work.
H. Shelton Smith, Director of Leadership Training.
Paul H. Vieth, Director of Research and Service.

Officers of the Committee

J. M. Artman, *Chairman*
Cynthia Pearl Maus, *Vice-Chairman*
Percy R. Hayward, *Secretary*

The Goal of the Christian Quest

THE goal of the Christian Quest is to weave the strands of Christian motive and purpose into the growing fabric of the ever-present quests of youth. For, go on quests they will, these youth of our day, quests of mind, eager searches of the body, quests for material gain, quests for new achievement, quests for the undiscovered secrets that God always holds beyond the fringe of our present knowledge as a reward for the intrepid pioneer. Shall they go forth on a pagan or a Christian quest, seeking a pagan or a Christian society, finding a pagan or a Christian answer to our problems of race and war and social strife? Shall the quest of their hearts be for a material kingdom, for mercenary success as an end in itself, for mere sensual thrill and satisfaction, for a devotion only to old forms and out-grown ways, or for a fellowship with God that shall be vital and transforming, for the Kingdom of God on earth, for new interpretations of the meaning of the age-old Evangel, for Christian habit in every area of life, and for a society that shall indeed be Christian? Shall they indeed seek first the Kingdom of God? Only the future can answer.